UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,954	07/28/2003	Stefan Kusterer	34874-073 UTIL	6169

64280 7590 12/14/2006

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 600
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,954	KUSTERER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas Augustine	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11/19/2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/28/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Polizzi (US 6,643,661 B2).

As for independent claims 1 and 22, Polizzi teaches a method and corresponding article comprising: uniting navigation hierarchies (categories) from different application sources (fig.3 and col.5, line 65); and providing a unified navigation area based on the united navigation hierarchy (fig.10; wherein is depicted a graphical user interface where there is a homogenous view of the data source being displayed to the user at to which the user can select any one of the objects which represent different data sources from the

dynamic menu as depicted in figure 10).

As for dependent claims 2 and 23, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 1 and corresponding article of claim 22, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies comprises supplying a navigation service (service broker (125) col.9, line 54; wherein this agent controls the navigation of data on the portal page) with a navigation object model (fig.3) that provides, to a presentation layer, a homogeneous view of navigation information from the different application sources (fig.10; wherein this figure depicts the graphical user interface, where items 1035,1001,1080,1085,1010,1005 and the like are all items which pertain to the navigation categories or object models).

As for dependent claims 3 and 24, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 2 and corresponding article of claim 23, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies (col.21, line 47) further comprises: accepting connectors for the different application sources (col.21, line 51; wherein the user interacts with a display button which the system accepts the connector for a different application source); and receiving the navigation information from the different application sources through the connectors according to the navigation object model (col.21, lines 58-59; wherein the user is inputting information regarding different application sources to which the data is being stored on a repository in a hierarchy document object model for navigational purposes).

As for dependent claims 4 and 25, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 3 and

corresponding article of claim 24, wherein accepting connectors for the different application sources comprises receiving a registration request from a connector for a given application (col.9, lines 3 and 11; wherein the user defined a link to an application source to which this link is stored on the repository), receipt of the registration request resulting in the navigation service having an identifier for the given connector (col.10, lines 50-51 and 56; wherein when a user adds an object, it will be placed in the repository with a unique identifiers), and said receiving the navigation information comprises receiving navigation nodes (col.10, lines 50-51), from the given connector, as defined by the navigation object model, the received navigation nodes including the connector identifier (col.10, line 56; wherein the objects are stored in a hierarchy on the repository which unique identifiers).

As for dependent claims 5 and 26, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 4 and corresponding article of claim 25, further comprising selecting a connector to contact based on a connector identifier from a navigation node in the united navigation hierarchy (col.9, line 56 and col.10, line 51; wherein the user can select any of the objects presented on the portal page (fig.10) at which the service broker (125) handles the request of calling the objects from the repository (235) wherein each object is identifiable with unique identifiers as understood to those skilled in the art.)

As for dependent claims 6 and 27, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 2 and corresponding article of claim 23, wherein providing the unified navigation area

comprises displaying a navigation window in a portal presentation, the navigation window including navigation links to resources of the different application sources, the navigation links being organized according to the united navigation hierarchy (fig.10; wherein it is depicted of the organization of the user customized portable page at which each object is organized in a hierarchy (col.5, line 65), also note that the user as evident from figure 10 has a list objects to which are in hierarchy as depicted from item (1001)).

As for dependent claims 7 and 28, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 2 and corresponding article of claim 23, wherein the united navigation hierarchy comprises navigation nodes defined by the navigation object model, the method further comprising: receiving a navigation action; and changing at least one of the navigation nodes in accordance with the received navigation action (col.21, line 56; wherein the user is placing a navigation action to the service broker to change the portal page at which the action of editing and adding to the portable page as noted in above claims).

As for dependent claims 8 and 29, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 2 and corresponding article of claim 23, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises merging at least two navigation objects from the different application sources based on a merge identifier (col.22, lines 33-36 and figure 10; wherein the user can merge object onto a display area as depicted by figure 10 and described as mentioned by reference in col.22).

As for dependent claims 9 and 30, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 8 and corresponding article of claim 29, wherein the united navigation hierarchy comprises a graph of linking relationships among navigation objects (wherein it is evident that the portal page can display a wide arrange of objects that included being of (presentation graphics, executable jobs such as brio reports, oracle reports, SAP reports to which is known in the art which can execute a graph showing linking relationships. Also note col.11, line 4 for the similar graphing of linking relationship.

As for dependent claims 10 and 31, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 2 and corresponding article of claim 23, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises dynamically loading the united navigation hierarchy (col.23, line 46).

As for dependent claims 11 and 32, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 2 and corresponding article of claim 23, further comprising enabling setting of a node as a new root of the united navigation hierarchy for display (col.20, lines 61-62; wherein the user defines the root node of the object in the hierarchy to be displayed, such that when the user logs into the system they will be presented with the root node first, so thus by allowing to change this first display object is essentially changing the root node in the hierarchy, also note the above teachings of the hierarchy.

As for independent claim 12, Polizzi teaches a portal system having a presentation level (125) and a data level (235) (fig.2), the portal system comprising: a navigation service

module including a navigation object model that provides a homogeneous view of navigation information from different application sources to the presentation level (note the analysis of claim 2); and navigation connectors that operate with the different application sources to provide the navigation information from the data level to the navigation service module (note the analysis of claim 3).

As for dependent claim 13, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 12, wherein the navigation connectors include connector identifiers that are included in navigation nodes generated by the navigation connectors to provide the navigation information (note the analysis of claim 4).

As for dependent claim 14, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 12, wherein the navigation connectors generate navigation nodes according to the navigation object model to provide the navigation information (note the analysis of claim 4), the navigation nodes including at least one merge identifier that indicates similar content in two navigation nodes from different applications and that results in a merger of the two navigation nodes (note the analysis of claim 8).

As for dependent claim 15, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 12, wherein the navigation object model defines navigation nodes used to represent the navigation information from the different application sources, the navigation nodes including a linking relationship to other nodes that are not in a parent child relationship in the

homogeneous view of the navigation information (personal dashboard, wherein on is displayed nodes which are apart of the linking relationship which are displayed to the user homogeneously by user custom tailored which depicted in figure 10 is non-parent child relationship. Also note that if the user decided to do so this could view much like a parent child relationship).

As for dependent claim 16, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 12, wherein the navigation service module is configured to read data from the different application sources using the navigation connectors but not to write data to the different application sources using the navigation connectors (col.9, line 3; as previously discussed Polizzi teaches the personal dashboard to be configured to display connectors to metadata from the internet in which turn this data is being read and not written to. He also explains how there are permissions that set certain rules on items one being the restriction of writing or deleting a connector).

As for dependent claim 17, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 12, wherein the navigation service module dynamically loads a united navigation hierarchy when providing the homogeneous view of the navigation information (note the analysis of claim 10).

As for dependent claim 18, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 17, wherein a role editor (which is user defined, that of nothing more than a control module as described

by Polizzi in claim 11) allows setting a node as a new root of the united navigation hierarchy for display for users that belong to a role (note the analysis of claim 11).

As for independent claim 19, Polizzi teaches a system comprising: means for uniting navigation hierarchies from different application sources; and means for providing a unified navigation area based on the united navigation hierarchy (note the analysis of claim 1).

As for dependent claim 20, Polizzi teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the means for uniting the navigation hierarchies comprises a navigation object model that includes definitions of a connector interface to the different application sources and a navigation data interface to a presentation layer (note the analysis of claims 2 and 3).

As for dependent claim 21, Polizzi teaches the system of claim 20, wherein the means for uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises INavigationService means for abstracting navigation operations, the connector interface comprises INavigationConnector means for plugging an application into the INavigationService means, and the navigation data interface comprises INavigationNode means for accessing navigation information from the different application sources (col.9, line 53; the service agents: service broker, knowledge server, search server, crawl server, event server, authentication server, name server, job server, network server; wherein each of the above mentioned agents provide the means described in claim 21).

Note: *the entire reference(s) should be taken in as a whole, applicant should fully read and understand the cited reference(s) in order to appropriately reply back to this office action. Ideas and motivation will not be fully understood with the lack of understanding from the reference(s) as a whole. Partial reading from specific column and line numbers will lead to a misunderstanding of principles and ideas since applicants can be there own lexicographer. Also the specific column and line numbers cited are to provide for a quick reference point in the mentioned reference(s) and not that of the only meaning and sole definition of a word, phrase, principle and/or idea expressed therein. The examiner has added extra explanation on a claim-to-claim basis for a better understanding of the principles and ideas from the author(s) of the cited reference(s). This explanation should not be taken for the exact and whole definition of principles and ideas taught by the author(s) of the cited reference(s).*

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- **Ku et al (US 6,462,762)** – Displaying a hierarchy and changing the root node.
- **Dev et al (US 6,049,828)** – Displaying and navigating through a hierarchy representing different data sources.
- **Boloker et al (US 7,028,306 B2)** – Document object model with dynamic loading, transfer of root node, and a browser user interface into the DOM that is a hierarchy of data sources.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Augustine
Examiner
AU: 2179

N. Augustine
December 09, 2006

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER